DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 275 CS 009 227

AUTHOR Knupp, Richard
TITLE Improving Oral Reading Skills of Educationally Handicapped Elementary School-Aged Students through Repeated Readings.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 80p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Learning Disabilities; *Oral Reading; Reading Difficulties; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Remedial Reading; Word Recognition
IDENTIFIERS Reading Fluency; *Repeated Readings

ABSTRACT

A study examined the efficacy of the repeated readings method in improving the oral reading rate, decreasing the number of oral reading errors, and improving the oral reading comprehension accuracy of educationally handicapped students. The oral reading skills of eight students from an urban northeastern United States community identified as educationally handicapped were measured over a 12-week period using the Analytical Reading Inventory as pre- and posttests. After placement at the appropriate reading level, subjects (N=8) were assigned 100-word segments to read aloud individually to the instructor. The oral reading rate, number of errors, and comprehension were recorded by the instructor. Subjects began a new story when they could read 85 words per minute. Results indicated that poor readers learned to develop reading speed and fluency with repeated practice. The subjects improved their reading speed and comprehension and decreased the number of word errors. (Thirty references, eight tables of data and several evaluation instruments are appended.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297275

PRACTICUM REPORT

IMPROVING ORAL READING SKILLS OF EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-AGED STUDENTS THROUGH REPEATED READINGS

BY

RICHARD KNUPP

Center for the
Advancement of Educatio
Ed.D. Program

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard H. Knupp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/475-7300

CS007227

NOVA UNIVERSITY

IMPROVING ORAL READING SKILLS OF EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-AGED STUDENTS THROUGH REPEATED READINGS

by

Richard Knupp

Cluster 26 A

A Practicum I Report Presented to the Ed.D. Program
in Early and Middle Childhood
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University
1988

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: Paul V. Lacity

Paul V. Lacity, Ed.D.

Superintendent of Schools
Title

1809 Pacific Avenue
Address

Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
City and State

3/1/88
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Richard H. Knupp under the direction of the advisor listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

4-28-88
Date of Final Approval of Report

Mary Ellen Sapp
Mary Ellen Sapp, Ph.D., Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iii

LIST OF TABLES..... v

ABSTRACT..... vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION..... 1

Description of Community..... 1
Author's Work Setting and Role..... 2

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM..... 7

Problem Description..... 7
Problem Documentation..... 8
Causative Analysis..... 15
The Related Literature..... 16

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS..... 23

Statement of General Goals..... 23
Behavioral Expectations..... 23
Evaluation Instruments..... 24
Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Results..... 25

IV SOLUTION STRATEGY..... 26

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions.... 26
Description of Selected Solutions..... 30
Report of Action Taken.....35

V RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....38

Results.....38
Conclusions.....44
Recommendations.....45
Dissemination.....46
References.....47

REFERENCES..... 47

Appendices

A TEACHER QUESTIONAIRRE FOR ORAL READING.....50

B. SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL HANDICAPS OF STUDENTS.....52

C. BI-MONTHLY RECORD FOR READING GAINS.....54

D. MECHANISM FOR RECORDING UNEXPECTED EVENTS.....56

E. QUESTIONS FOR PLACEMENT PROCEDURE.....58

F. MECHANISM FOR RECORDING SPEED, ERRORS, COMPREHENSION.....65

G. MECHANISM FOR RECORDING SPEED, ERRORS.....67

H. RATIONALE FOR TIMED READING TEST.....69

I. TEACHER VERIFICATION OF PRACTICUM.....71

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Timed Reading Test, Independent Level	9
2	Timed Reading Test, Instructional Level	10
3	Timed Reading Test, Frustrational Level	12
4	Metropolitan Achievement Test	13
5	Reading Book Placements	34
6	Comparison of timed reading speed, Forms A&B	38
7	Comparison of timed reading errors, Forms A&B	40
8	Comparison of timed comprehension, Forms A&B	42

ABSTRACT

Improving Oral Reading Skills of Educationally Handicapped Elementary School-Aged Students Through Repeated Readings. Knupp, Richard H., 1988: Practicum Report, Nova University Ed.D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Intermediate Grades/Elementary Grades/Learning Disabilities/Reading Difficulties/Remedial Reading/Oral Reading/Reading Programs/Reading Fluency/Word Recognition

This practicum addressed the problem of educationally handicapped students who had poor oral reading skills. The primary goal was to improve the oral reading rates for students identified as having educational handicaps. The second goal was to decrease the number of oral reading errors made by the students. The final goal was to improve their oral reading comprehension accuracy.

The writer implemented the repeated readings method that was designed to improve the students' oral reading speed and comprehension and decrease their word error rates. This method was based on the premise that when poor readers learn to develop reading fluency, they require less attention in decoding. As a result, the students can concentrate on reading comprehension.

The results of the practicum were positive. Analysis of the data revealed that students were able to improve their reading speed and comprehension and decrease the number of word errors. The resource room teacher who assisted with this practicum has included the repeated readings method along with his regular classroom curriculum.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Community

The school in which the practicum took place is situated in a northeastern United States urban community that has experienced enormous change in the past eleven years. In that time, new industry has provided employment for over fifty thousand people. However, because the industry has bought so much land that previously contained homes, apartments, and businesses, many residents and small businesses have been forced to relocate outside of the city. As a result of new industry, enormous demands have been made on the housing, transportation, and utility industries. Thus, the surrounding communities have witnessed enormous growth in these areas while the city, except for the building of new industry, remains virtually the same as it was eleven years ago.

Within twelve miles of the city are located a federal aviation testing facility, a two-year junior college, and a four-year state college. These facilities, including an extension campus of the junior college located within the city, provide employment for thousands of people who live in the city and surrounding communities.

The socioeconomic make-up of the city is generally lower- and middle-class. Inspite of the enormous wealth amassed by the new industry, many of the residents subsist at the poverty level. The school district's minority

population had been increasing proportionately during the previous decade as whites moved to suburban districts or placed their children in parochial or private schools. Most of the industry's employees reside in communities outside of the city (Office of Superintendent, 1987).

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The school district in which the practicum took place reflects the enormous change experienced by the city. Prior to the arrival of the new industry in 1976, the student population was 8,752. As of September, 1986, the student population had decreased to 6,519. The district-wide school population, including students from four sending communities, is composed of 1,076 students who are Caucasion, 4,304 who are Black, 1,042 who are Hispanic, 95 who are Asian Pacific Islander, and 2 who are American Indian (Office of Superintendent, 1987).

Until 1986, the local school board was appointed by the mayor. In 1986, a referendum was passed that stated that Board members will be elected in public elections. The present school board's philosophy states that education should integrate the home, school, and community in meeting the needs of children. The best kind of education, the board believes, provides for the child's physical, mental, social and moral development (Board of Education Policy, Governance Manual, 1983).The school board employs 500 staff and administrators (Office of Superintendent, 1987).

The elementary school in which the practicum took place is one of eleven school facilities, including eight elementary schools, two junior high schools, and one high school. A new superintendent of schools was elected in July 1987. In 1983, the local board of education approved a grade reorganization of its elementary schools from a grades K-6, 7-8 program to a K-8 program. A new high school has also been recommended to replace the existing stucture (Falzetta, 1987). As of August, 1987, neither the reorganization nor the building of the new high school had been accomplished.

The school in which the practicum took place is supervised by one principal. There are 28 teachers at the school, 25 of whom teach academic classes. These 25 teachers are certified to teach elementary grades kindergarten to 6 and provide instruction in all subjects. Seven are Caucasion, 19 are Black, 1 is Hispanic, and 1 is Asian (Office of Superintendent, 1986).

All of the elementary school students in which the practicum took place receive free lunches as determined by Federally sponsored programs. Eighty percent of the students come from families who receive welfare compensation (Office of Superintentent, 1987).

Academic classes are grouped according to grade. Along with regular classes of English, science, math, physical education, art, and computer education, students are encouraged to participate in music classes. All academic

students are required to take the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Those students whose test results in reading and math fall below the standards accepted by the local board of education must receive compensatory education in the area(s) of weakness. Students who achieve in the 99 percentile in reading and math subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test are accepted into a gifted and talented program.

Of the 409 students enrolled at the school, 58 receive special education for one or two hours a day in three resource rooms. These students spend the remainder of the day in their academic classrooms. Three teachers who are certified by the State to teach special education provide individualized instruction to each student in his or her area of weakness (Office of Superintendent, 1987).

Comprehensive evaluations for each student in the resource room are completed by each member of the child study team, including the school nurse, medical doctor, psychologist, learning disabilities teacher/consultant, and social worker. A certified speech therapist provides instruction for students identified as having speech difficulties.

Members of the child study team, other school personnel, and parent(s) assist in writing each student's individualized education program (IEP). The IEP, which includes statements of annual goals and measurable objectives, is written to insure that each student identified as educationally handicapped will receive

individualizd instruction that meets his or her educational needs (Administrative Code, Title 6, 1984).

The resource room in which the writer's practicum took place has been designated as a "mixed handicap" program for students with different classifications. The students in the resource room have been classified by the child study team as either perceptually impaired or socially maladjusted. Students classified as being perceptually impaired have normal intelligence but have specific learning disabilities which interfere with their ability to think, speak, read, spell, listen/ and or compute without the assistance of special education. The students classified as socially maladjusted behave in a manner that interferes with their own education and the education of others. The State Department of Education has stated that students who have been determined to be eligible for special education and/or related services will be referred to as educationally handicapped (Administrative Code, Title 6, 1984). As a result of the State's determination, students classified as either perceptually impaired or socially maladjusted will henceforth be referred to in this practicum as educationally handicapped.

The writer has worked for the school district for nine years, the past seven years as learning disabilities teacher/consultant with four major responsibilities. The writer makes educational diagnoses with other members of the child study team, recommends special education programs for

pupils considered to be educationally handicapped from grades preschool to twelve, provides inservice training for teachers, administrators, and parents, and assists the Assistant Superintendent of Special Services. He is also employed as an adjunct professor of developmental studies at the local community college.

The writer holds an undergraduate degree in English education and a master's degree in learning disabilities. He is certified by the State Department of Education as a teacher of English, grades 7-12, a learning disabilities teacher/consultant, and a principal/supervisor.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

During the past seven years, the writer has worked as a learning disabilities teacher/consultant on a child study team. In that time, he has administered hundreds of oral reading assessments to students being reevaluated by the child study team to determine the status of their educational handicaps. Tests utilized include the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977) and the Gates Mckillop Reading Diagnostic Test (Gates & Mckillop, 1967). The writer has observed that the students whose oral reading skills are being assessed often pause at unknown words and ask for pronunciations, make word substitutions, or skip the words entirely. The students read very slowly and usually fail to comprehend what they read. The writer also observed informally that the resource room teacher who instructs the educationally handicapped students often supplies the readers with unknown words during infrequent oral reading lessons.

State law (Administrative Code, Title 6, 1984) dictates that the resource room will give instruction in courses not taught outside the resource room. After surveying regular education teachers who have Special Education students, the writer observed that the educationally handicapped students did not receive reading instruction when they were in their regular classrooms. Instead, the students received reading

instruction for one to two hours per day when they were in the resource room. The writer observed, however, that the teacher did not teach oral reading skills.

In conclusion, the problem addressed by the practicum was that the elementary school-aged students identified by the child study team as being educationally handicapped had poor oral reading skills.

Problem Documentation

In order to provide documentation of the problem stated in the previous section, the writer chose to investigate the curriculum that is being used in several resource rooms located throughout the school district. Eight resource room teachers were asked two questions concerning the importance of oral reading in the classroom (see Appendix A).

Seven of the eight teachers answered, "yes", to the first question, "Is oral reading an important skill to be taught to my students". However, none of the teachers responded with the answer,"yes", to the question,"I have a specific curriculum for teaching oral reading to my students". When interviewed informally, all of the resource room teachers informed the writer that their oral reading lessons consisted of merely listening to each student read a sentence or two. All of the teachers agreed that their methods do not emphasize the improvement of each student's ability to read more quickly and make fewer word identification errors. The teachers believed that their

major goal was to improve each student's ability to comprehend what was read.

The informal survey supported the writer's contention that oral reading skills were not being taught to the educationally handicapped students. The resource room teachers unanimously agreed with the writer's contention but were unsure of specific plans other than allowing each student a brief amount of time to read orally.

The writer stated that the students identified by the child study team as being educationally handicapped had poor oral reading skills. As a result, the students read very slowly, made frequent word errors, and comprehended little of what they read. To document this contention, the writer assessed the reading performance of the eight students in the resource room. All students were given form A of the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). Each student's independent, instructional, and frustration reading levels was recorded. Woods and Moe determined that the independent level is the level at which the student reads at least 99 percent of the words and achieves at least 90 percent comprehension.

Table 1

Results of Timed Reading Test

	Independent level

(table continues)

Student	Grade (a)	Wpm	Epm	%	Grade (b)
A	1	50	2	100	6
B	1	67	4	100	6
C	2	61	4	100	6
D	3	120	3	88	6
E	1	75	3	100	5
F	1	44	4	100	4
G	2	72	2	88	4
H	1	40	9	100	4

Note:

Grade (a) = Grade level achieved

Wpm = Words per minute

Epm = Errors per minute

% = Comprehension percentage

Grade (b) = Actual grade level

The data in table 1 indicated that the independent reading levels of all eight students were between three and five grade levels below their actual reading levels.

The student's instructional level is the level at which he reads 95 percent of the words and achieves 75 percent comprehension (Woods & Moe, 1977).

Table 2

Results of Timed Reading Test

(table continues)

	Instructional level				
Student	Grade (a)	Wpm	Epm	%	Grade (b)
A	2	49	2	84	6
B	2	60	3	68	6
C	3	62	5	75	6
D	4	100	5	75	6
E	2	79	4	84	5
F	2	39	6	68	4
G	3	76	2	75	4
H	2	39	6	68	4

Note:

Grade (a)= Grade level achieved

Wpm = Words per minute

Epm = Errors per minute

% = Comprehension percentage

Grade (b)= Actual grade level

The data in table 2 indicated that the instructional reading levels of all eight students were between two and four grades below their actual grade levels.

The student's frustration level is reached when he reads fewer than 90 percent of the words with comprehension no greater than 50 percent (Woods & Moe, 1977).

Table 3

Results of Timed Reading Test

		Frustrational level			
Student	Grade (a)	Wpm	Epm	%	Grade (b)
A	3	50	5	50	6
B	3	69	3	50	6
C	4	62	5	50	6
D	5	92	5	25	6
E	3	58	6	13	5
F	3	36	9	40	4
G	4	66	3	37	4
H	3	36	9	40	4

Note:

Grade (a) = Grade level achieved

Wpm = Words per minute

Epm = Errors per minute

% = Comprehension percentage

Grade (b) = Actual grade level

The data in table 3 indicated that the frustrational reading levels of all eight students were between zero and three grades below their actual grade levels.

As each student read orally, the writer timed the reading rate and word errors made in one minute. Reading comprehension was also assessed. Woods and Moe (1977) do not include timed assessments in their test; however, the writer included timed reading (see Appendix B for rationale for timed reading).

Poor oral reading skills might have contributed to the fact that none of the students identified as having educational handicaps scored at the 50th percentile in reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT). The writer was aware, however, that there were probably many other factors that affected each student's performance on the MAT. Among these factors might be poor time-on-task behaviors and limited perceptual abilities.

The data in table 4 showed that all eight students were unable to read at the 50th percentile on the reading subtest. Further, the data indicated that the reading instruction the students were receiving was not giving them the skills needed to allow them to succeed on standardized tests.

Table 4

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test

Student	Grade (a)	Percentile	Grade (b)
A	3.0	9	6

(table continues)

Student	Grade (a)	Percentile	Grade (b)
B	3.1	10	6
C	3.2	15	6
D	4.4	40	6
E	2.2	10	5
F	2.6	25	4
G	4.0	32	4
H	2.8	27	4

Note:

Grade (a) = Grade level achieved

Grade (b) = Actual grade level

The school board uses the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) to measure reading and math levels of all of its elementary and junior high school students. The tests are used to identify students whose skills fall below the minimum percentiles identified by the board of education. On several occasions, the writer observed that the students in the resource room seemed to become anxious when the teacher asked individuals to read orally. None of the students volunteered to read and each often told the teacher of his or her dislike for reading orally. As a result, the teacher selected students to read. When students read

aloud, others occasionally ridiculed them. Consequently, oral reading lessons were often quickly terminated.

Causative Analysis

The writer believed that there were a number of factors that contributed to the poor oral reading skills of the eight students identified as having educational handicaps. An important factor was the that each student had been identified by the child study team as having specific educational handicaps (see Appendix B). Consequently, these students enter the resource room with various learning difficulties that contribute to their depressed reading levels.

A second factor to be considered was that there was not a definite study procedure that the resource room teacher used to teach oral reading skills to the educationally handicapped students. The resource room teacher stated that his students rarely read orally. On those occasions, he assisted each student with the pronunciation of unfamiliar words and did not suggest procedures so that the students could read them independently.

The third factor contributing to the problem was that the resource room students did not seem to be aware of the importance of reading, particularly oral reading. When asked the following question, "Do you believe that reading either silently or orally is an important skill that you should learn"?, all of the students answered, "yes".

However, when asked, "Do you read when you are not at school"?, all of the students replied with negative answers.

A fourth contributing factor to the problem was the possibility that the educationally handicapped students were not assigned specific books in which theyc ould become competent readers. The resource room teacher stated that he informally assessed each student's reading skills because of insufficient time to make formal assessments. If the student read a randomly selected passage from a particular book without too much difficulty, he was placed in that reading level.

The Related Literature

Hoffman and Clements (1984) found that during oral reading lessons, poor readers differ considerably from good readers in their reading habits. The poor readers pay less attention, have less teacher contact, and display less on-task behavior. When word errors are made, they affect the text meaning. If unable to pronounce an unfamiliar word, the poor reader tends to wait for teacher assistance. The good reader, however, reads without interruption and is more likely to self-correct or to make repeated attempts at word identification without teacher assistance. Further, Hoffman and Clements believed that both teachers and students mutually reinforce the behaviors of each other. Often, teachers assist poor readers more consistently so that the curriculum can be covered with fewer hesitations.

Research has shown that poor readers read more slowly, make more word errors, and comprehend less than good readers. Samuels (1979) and Anderson (1981) suggested that poor readers must pay more attention to decoding inspite of their limited skills in this area. Consequently, their reading is slow and halting and reading comprehension is depressed. The higher-ability readers, on the contrary, are able to focus their attention on comprehension because less concentration is require in decoding.

Hu-pei Au (1977) also concluded that good and poor readers differ in their application of reading skills. The author observed that good readers make fewer omissions and use context to correct their errors. These students also make more repetitions in attempts to resolve their difficulties. The poor readers, however, make meaningless word substitutions, omit a higher percentage of words, rarely self-correct, and read slowly.

Rose (1984) indicated that students who demonstrate deficient oral reading skills do not attain the reading levels of good readers. These skills include the ability to use phonics, self-correct word errors, preview, and comprehend. Unfortunately, Rose contended, teachers avoid the use of efficient oral reading instruction. Teachers believe that oral reading is a skill that will be useless to students when they become adults. Also, Rose found that many teachers believe that oral reading instruction

interferes with the students' ability to improve silent reading speed and comprehension.

O'Conner, Stuck, and Wyne (1979) observed that the time-on-task of poor readers is minimal. As a result, the achievement of these learners does not increase in proportion with good readers who spend more time-on-task. It appears, the authors believed, that the longer a student retains limited on-task behaviors, he or she is apt to encounter more difficulties as complex academic demands are made.

The reading improvement of educationally handicapped learners is often inhibited by their inabilility to discriminate suffixes such as verb inflectional endings (Henderson & Shores, 1982). The authors suggested that there are numerous causes for this problem which should be considered by teachers. For example, individual students fail to use context to make corrections while other students do not recognize when they make meaningless word identifications. Others lack adequate perceptual and language skill that are necessary for attending and concentrating on printed language.

Hoffman and Baker (1987) stated that the oral reading strategies used by many teachers are nothing more than interactions between the teacher and student. The typical interaction usually follows the pattern of:

a. Student reads to teacher;

b. If errors are made,

c. Teacher supplies the student with corrections.

Stategies such as the one considered above give little insight into the actual reading patterns of the poor reader. As a result, more effective instruction strategies fail to be developed.

Hutson and Niles (1981) believed that when the poor reader is given the opportunity to read orally, the material is often too difficult for him to read. Also, the student feels anxious and embarrassed as he struggles through his reading. Consequently, the poor reader fails to develop more effective strategies for reading and instead, merely calls out words.

Reading lessons, especially those in which the student must read aloud, are often terminated abruptly after only a few students have read (King, 1977). King observed that many teachers quickly call on a skilled reader when the unskilled reader appears visibly upset. Consequently, the unskilled reader receives no remediation for his specific reading handicaps.

Heinrich (1978) suggested that the traditionally used round-robin reading method (each student is given the chance to read aloud while others in the group follow in their readers) causes the poor reader a great deal of embarrassment. On the contrary, the better reader is often bored by the routine because it offers him little challenge. The teacher also becomes discouraged because reading lessons do not progress smoothly.

Johns (1982) concluded that the round-robin reading method assesses the students' ability to call words and ignores the need to improve their fluency, reading rate, and comprehension. The low-ability readers becomes frustrated and embarrassed because of their continuing inability to read fluently.

Recently, Gilbert and Dardig (1976) and Hoffman (1987) suggested that the round-robin method of teaching oral reading might have little or no effect on student reading achievement. Hoffman, for example, noticed that in almost every class he observed, the teacher used this turn-taking routine. The teachers stated that the procedure was not taught to them in college; rather, they had adopted the practice after observing other teachers or being taught this way during their school years. Most of the teachers observed by Hoffman stated that it was their belief that round-robin reading was beneficial to the students.

Inspite of its apparent ineffectiveness, round-robin reading instruction is frequently the only oral reading experience in which many students engage (Whisler, 1976). Whisler maintained that this method is ineffective because the poorer readers are forced (usually unsuccesfully) to keep pace with the good readers. The good readers, however, become bored when following along while the poor readers struggle with their passages. Whisler stated that it is unfortunate that many teachers are often unsure about other strategies for teaching oral reading and are hesitant to

search for alternatives for fear of receiving negative feedback from parents.

Karwoski (1983) concluded that while many teachers have removed the round-robin reading technique from their classroom, they have begun to refrain from using any other methods for teaching oral reading. Teachers avoid oral reading instruction, Karwoski reported, because the poor readers cause the lessons to proceed too slowly. When these readers are called upon to read, they dislay limited fluency, expression, and self-confidence.

Lovitt and Hansen (1976a, 1976b) believed that reading teachers often use questionable methods to place their students in reading books. Three of these methods are dependent upon chronological age or grade, scores on achievement tests, and scores from placement tests which accompany basal texts. All three methods, according to Lovitt and Hanson, suggest improper placements. Placed in reading books that do not allow them to become competent readers, the students instead become frustrated and anxious.

Research has shown that the child's success or failure at learning to read depends not only on the expertise of the teacher but also on the involvement of the parent (Hosklsson, Sherman, & Smith, 1974). The authors point out that teachers, unfortunately, find themselves unprepared in suggesting methods that the parents can use at home. Because children bring to school different degrees of reading readiness, they apply their own rules by which they

have been taught to communicate. Those children whose communication rules are similar to those in the print are better able to process the written language. The children whose communication rules differ from the print, however, may experience more difficulty in processing written language.

Research has indicated that teachers are confronted with an almost overwhelming number of problems that can interfere with the development of a worthwhile oral reading program. For example, students enter school with varying degrees of reading readiness, communication, perceptual, and social skills (Hoskisson, Sherman, & Smith, 1974). Research has also suggested that poor readers differ enormously from good readers in their application of reading skills. As a result, the poor readers often receive little instruction in oral reading skills because of their tendency to make lesson proceed too slowly (Hoffman & Clements, 1984). Also, researchers have questioned the effectiveness of a number of strategies that are presently being used by educators for making reading book placements and teaching oral reading skills (Hoffman, 1987; Lovitt & Hansen, 1976a, 1976b; Samuels, 1979).

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Statement of General Goals

Eight students were selected to participate in the practicum, all of whom had been identified by members of the child study team as being educationally handicapped (see Appendix B). Three general goals were planned for the project. The first goal was to improve the oral reading rates for students identified as having educational handicaps. The second goal was to decrease the number of oral reading errors made by students identified as having educational handicaps. The third goal was to improve the oral reading comprehension accuracy of students identified as having educational handicaps.

Behavioral Expectations

Four terminal objectives were planned for the project. The first objective stated that over a period of 12 weeks, elementary school-aged students who have been identified as having educational handicaps will improve their instructional oral reading level rates as measured by making 50 percent fewer errors on an informal reading inventory.

The second objective stated that over a period of 12 weeks, elementary school-aged students identified as having educational handicaps will decrease their instructional oral reading level error rate as measured by making at least 50 percent fewer errors on an informal reading inventory.

The third objective stated that over a period of 12 weeks, elementary school-aged students identified as having educational handicaps will improve their instructional oral reading comprehension level accuracy as measured by attaining an instructional reading level score of at least 75 percent comprehension on an informal reading inventory.

The fourth objective stated that after the 12 week practicum period, the resource room teacher who instructs the elementary-aged students identified as having educational handicaps will implement the oral reading strategy as a supplement to the regular developmental reading program.

Evaluation Instruments

All four objectives were measured by the writer. As each student read orally from form B of the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977), he was timed until the passage was completed. When the student completed the passage, the writer computed the number of words read per minute. Results from form B were compared with the results from form A (see Table Six).

The second objective was measured by computing the number of word errors the student made in one minute as he read orally from form B of the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). The number of word errors the student made in form B was compared with the word errors he made in form A (see Table Seven).

The third objective was measured by comparing the percentage of correct answers to comprehension questions in form B of the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). The percentage of correct answers the student made in form B was compared with the percentage of correct answers he made in form A (see Table Eight).

The fourth objective was measured by the resource room teacher who recorded bi-monthly gains each student made in words read per minute, errors made per minute, and percentage of correct answers to comprehension questions (see Appendix C).

Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Events

Both the writer and teacher kept daily logs (see Appendix D). The logs contained anecdotal information regarding the successes and failures of each student. At the end of each week, the logs were reviewed to ensure that all students were progressing to the best of their ability.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions

The writer investigated several oral reading strategies that he believed could be implemented to help eight elementary school-aged students who had been identified by the child study team as having educational handicaps. A review of the literature indicated that many of the strategies could be implemented with no extra cost to the school district (Heinrich, 1978; Samuels, 1979).

Research has suggested that students should be placed in reading texts that will enable them to improve their reading (Hoffman, 1987; Hoffman & Baker, 1987; Samuels, 1979). Lovitt and Hansen (1976a, 1976b) suggested that students are often placed in readers that prove to be too difficult. The authors concluded that the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) succeeds in making the proper placement. The IRI allows the teacher to diagnose the student's strengths and weaknesses in word attack and comprehension and identifies the independent, instructional, and frustration reading levels. It can also suggest strategies for remediation.

A possible strategy for teaching oral reading skills is to teach each student individually. Hoffman (1987), Hoskisson, Sherman, & Smith (1974) and Samuels (1979) suggested that poor readers can improve their reading skills if they receive individual instruction. The authors

believed that the traditionally used round-robin or turn-taking technique many teachers use only further contributes to the student's reading difficulties. The poor reader becomes embarrassed that others will listen to him read. Consequently, he does not volunteer to read to the class. Hoffman and Samuels suggested that individualized reading instruction encourages both the teacher and reader to develop better strategies. The teacher learns to examine the responses he makes to both good and poor readers and is also able to observe and record the miscues of each student, thereby enabling him to remediate specific learning difficulties.

Another possible strategy for teaching oral reading skills was researched by Samuels (1979), who believed that the poor reader who reads on a one-to-one basis with the teacher can improve his reading speed, accuracy, and comprehension. Samuel's method, which he calls the method of repeated readings, allows each student to reread selected passages until certain criteria are met. While one student reads with the teacher, the other student practices reading his passage. As the student reads, his reading speed and word errors are counted by the teacher. When an individual student is able to read 85 words per minute, he moves to the next passage.

The results of Samuel's (1979) research show that the more fluent the reader becomes, the faster he is able to

read. Further, the student's comprehension improves because he requires less effort in decoding.

Heinrich (1976) stated that good oral reading instruction will improve the reader's silent reading skills. The author contended that oral reading helps the student develop a sense of rhythm instead of merely calling out words. As a result, he "hears" what the words say and makes better sense of them. Heinrich recommended that no child be subjected to the embarrassing technique of round-robin reading. Instead, Heinrich suggested that the entire group read a story or poem after they have heard it read by the teacher. This encourages the students to imitate the teacher's reading rhythm. Choral reading, Heinrich believed, does not put the poor reader in a position that will be embarrassing.

The procedures used by Rose (1984) demonstrated that poor readers who are taught on a one-to-one basis can improve their reading speed. The two previewing procedures that were implemented, silent and listening, allowed the students to read or listen to a passage before instruction and/or testing. Both procedures were integrated with the existing reading texts.

Prior to reading, each student was assigned to preview a passage before instructional procedures were implemented. Individual students either previewed their passages silently or listened and followed along as the teacher read the

story. Next, each student read his story aloud but only in the presense of the teacher or researcher (Rose, 1984).

The results of the study (Rose, 1984) showed that the students who previewed the story by listening increased their oral reading rates when compared to the oral reading rates of students who previewed the story by reading silently. Rose believed, however, that his study left several questions unanswered. First, no students were asked to preview orally. Most importantly, Rose questioned whether or not the students would be able to apply their new skills in different reading situations that used new material or required new responses.

By using an informal reading inventory, Lovitt and Hansen (1976b) were able to place each student in his proper instructional reading level. Based on reading performance, each student was able to either skip passages or receive drill. When drilled, the student had to display an improved correct reading rate and comprehension.

Results of the study (Lovitt & Hansen, 1976b) showed that with the combination of skipping and drill, each student improved his average correct and incorrect reading rates and ability to comprehend. The results, the authors concluded, leave some doubt as to whether the drill sessions alone were responsible for the improvements. This might be possible because the drill focused on specific areas of weakness. However, the idea of being able to skip through

books might have been reinforcing enough to make possible the improvements.

Description of Selected Solution

Prior to selecting a solution that would improve the oral reading skills of students who were identified by the child study team as having educational handicaps, the writer concluded that the selected solution would have to be inexpensive and uncomplicated. Also, the solution would have to emphasize techniques that would assist the individual student in improving his ability to read more quickly, make fewer word errors, and comprehend better. A review of the literature indicated to the writer that several solutions would meet the criteria described above (Heinrich, 1976; Hoffman, 1987; Lovitt & Hansen, 1976a, 1976b; Rose, 1984; Samuels, 1979). The strategies described by these researchers allow the reading teacher to work individually with each student. They believed that individual instruction is necessary when working with poor readers. The more traditionally used round-robin oral reading technique, the authors concluded, should be avoided. As a result, each student in the practicum received one-to-one instruction.

The strategies suggested by Heinrich, (1976), Hoffman, (1987), Lovitt & Hansen, (1976a, 1976b), Rose, (1984), and Samuels, (1976) advocated the use of some form of practice reading. Heinrich believed that students learn to imitate the teacher's reading when they follow his preliminary

reading. Rose suggested that two forms of prereading activities, silent and listening, can be used. Samuel's method of repeated readings, which was used by the writer in this practicum, gives the poor reader the chance to practice reading a passage until it is mastered. Lovitt and Hanson allowed poor readers to skip passages if they displayed reading proficiency. If criteria were not met during the initial reading lesson, the student was drilled in his specific areas of weakness.

The writer agreed with Lovitt and Hansen (1976a) that students must be placed in appropriate readers. Proper placement with the use of an Informal Reading Inventory (IRI), Lovitt and Hansen stated, helps the student become a better reader. As a result of this conclusion, the writer used a IRI to place each student in his or her proper reader. The authors recommended that the IRI be developed from the reading material being used throughout testing an instruction. This procedure allows for a more accurate placement.

A review of the literature convinced the writer that the repeated readings method described by Samuel (1979) was the best method that would improve the oral reading skills of eight elementary school-aged students who had been identified by the child study team as having educational handicaps. The repeated readings method, according to Samuels, is both simple and inexpensive to implement yet suitable for students with educational handicaps. The

method can be used to improve the individual student's oral reading speed and comprehension and decrease his word error rate. Samuels concluded that when poor readers learn to develop reading fluency, they require less attention in decoding. As a result, the students can concentrate on comprehending the story.

The students who participated in this practicum were five boys and three girls, all of whom had been identified by the child study team as having educational handicaps. For one hour per day, the students reported to the resource room for instruction.

The Ginn Reading Series (1987) was used for placement and instruction. The series used thirteen readers: levels 2,3, and 4 were preprimers, level 5 was primer, level 6 was first grade, and so on until level 14, which was a seventh grade reader.

The writer's first concern was to place each student in his appropriate reader. To achieve this goal, the writer followed the placement procedure described by Lovitt and Hansen (1976a). Two oral reading and comprehension samples were collected from each reading level of the Ginn Reading Series (1987). The first 200 words from each story (separated into 100 word segments) were read from the first story of each book. If stories did not contain 200 words (found in the first three levels) samples were taken from consecutive stories that contained at least 100 words. Accompanying each 100 word segment were four comprehension

questions dealing with recall, sequence, interpretation, and vocabulary (see Appendix E).

For the first week of the practicum, the writer and teacher spent about 15 minutes a day (one hour periods, four days per week) with each of the students. During this time, each student read the first 100 words and answer the comprehension questions developed from the first seven readers. On the next day, each student read 100 words from the next seven readers. This practice was followed with each student until all of the segments were read.

While each student read, the writer and teacher kept count of the number of correctly and incorrectly read words (working with individual students). Errors were counted if they changed the meaning of the text. Both the writer and teacher gave the correct word if his student could not-self correct. Following each 100-word segment, the writer and teacher read the four questions and the students answered orally. During each segment, each student's oral correct words per minute, oral incorrect words per minute, and percentage of comprehension questions were recorded (see Appendix F).

Each student was placed in the reader in which he read correctly between 45-65 words per minute, 4-8 incorect words per minute, and answered correctly between 50-75 percent of the comprehension questions (Lovitt & Hanson, 1976a) (see Table 5).

Table 5

Reading Book Placements

Student	Wpm	Epm	%	Placement	Grade
A	60	3	50	3	6
B	58	8	25	3	6
C	61	3	50	4	6
D	64	2	50	5	6
E	45	9	25	3	5
F	63	4	50	3	4
G	38	12	25	3	4
H	52	9	25	2	4

Note:

Wpm = Words per minute

Epm = Errors per minute

% = Comprehension percentage

Placement = Reading placement

Grade = Actual grade level

During the next twelve weeks of the practicum, the writer implemented the method of repeated readings described by Samuels (1979). During the initial reading, the writer and teacher worked with individual students while the other students worked at their seats and practiced reading their

assigned passages (50-400 words, one hour periods, four days per week). The writer and teacher recorded the reading speed and number of word recognition errors per minute each student made (See Appendix G). Errors were counted only if they changed the meaning of the text. When the student was able to read 85 words per minute, he moved on to the next passage (See Appendix H for Rationale for Timed Reading).

During the final week of the practicum, the writer administered the instructional reading level, form B of the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). The results of this evaluation were compared with the results of form A of the Analytical Reading Inventory to measure the extent of each student's improvement in words read per minute, errors in word identification made per minute, and the percentage of reading comprehension questions answered correctly (see Tables Six, Seven, & Eight.).

Report of Action Taken

The solution used this practicum involved the use of a mixed handicap resource room for students with different educational handicaps. The students in the resource room had been classified by the child study team as either perceptually impaired or socially maladjusted. All of the students, who ranged from grades 4 to 6, read below grade level.

The solution strategy began with the week-long placement phase. The first component of this phase was to administer a writer-made informal reading inventory (see

Appendix E). The purpose of this informal reading inventory was to place each student in his or her appropriate reading level.

Upon completion of the placement phase, the students began reading in their assigned books. During each student's first reading, the writer and teacher worked with individual students while others did classwork. Next, the students who were doing classwork were asked to read with the writer and teacher while the first two readers practiced their passages. This procedure was repeated until all students were able to read at least 85 words per minute. When this rate was attained, the procedure was repeated with a new story.

During individual reading sessions, students were encouraged to concentrate and not become overly concerned with mistakes. They were also repeatedly reminded of the importance of attending school as much as possible.

Initially, the students seemed anxious at the thought of being timed while they read. The writer and teacher explained to each student that it was important to develop reading speed. As the reading sessions proceeded, however, the students began to express their delight in being timed. The presence of the stopwatch actually seemed to act as a motivator to the students. Only one student needed constant reinforcement to read more quickly thoughout the duration of the practicum.

The use of the weekly logs afforded the writer and teacher the opportunity to record any positive or negative comments made by students. It also enabled the writer and teacher to evaluate the progress of each student. Thus, individuals who required additional encouragement were quickly reinforced.

The final phase of the practicum was an evaluative one. The writer re-administered the instructional reading level of the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). However, all students were given form B of the test. The test was adminiministered to assess the students' gains or losses in reading speed, reading errors, and comprehension.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

Objective one was measured by the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). The specific objective, "Over a period of 12 weeks, elementary school-aged students who had been identified as having educational handicaps will improve their instructional oral reading level rates as measured by reading 50 percent more words per minute on an informal reading inventory", was met by 4 out of 8 students who participated in the practicum.

Four students were not successful in meeting the 50 percent criteria established for objective one. However, these students achieved a post-implementation mean score of ninety one words per minute as compared to the pre-imlementation mean score of sixty nine words per minute.

One student who was not successful in meeting the 50 percent criteria established for objective one had been identified by the child study team as having serious social difficulties which interfered with his own education. This student received numerous office referrals and suspensions form school during the three-month practicum period.

The data in table 6 summarize the results of objective one.

Table 6

Comparison of Timed Reading Tests, Forms A & B

(table continues)

	Instructional Level					
Student	Grade (a)		Wpm		Growth	Grade (b)
	A	B	A	B		
A	2	2	49	74	55%	6
B	2	2	60	92	53%	6
C	3	3	62	74	14%	6
D	4	4	100	134	34%	6
E	2	2	79	120	51%	5
F	2	2	39	65	66%	4
G	3	3	76	99	30%	4
H	2	2	39	58	48%	4

Note:

Grade (a) = Grade level achieved

A = Form A

B = Form B

Wpm = Words per minute

Growth = Increase in reading speed

Grade (b) = Actual grade level

It is possible that the 50 percent increase expected in words read per minute was unrealistic. Most of the students

clearly understood that they were to attempt to read as quickly as possible. Even though only 4 out of 8 students were able to meet the 50 percent criteria established in objective one, the difference between the reading speeds measured in forms A and B indicated that most of the students made efforts to improve their reading speeds. These students no longer hesitated at the end of sentences and ceased repeating entire phrases of sentences when only one word was misread.

Objective two was measured by the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977) The specific objective," Over a period of 12 weeks, elementary school-aged students identified as having educational handicaps will decrease their instructional oral reading level error rate as measured by making at least 50 percent fewer errors on an informal inventory", was met by 5 of the 8 students who participated in the practicum.

As noted in the first objective, the student who was often suspended from school was unable to meet the 50 percent criteria established for objective two. One other student was also unable to decrease the number of words errors he made. The third student, however, was able to decrease his word errors made per minute by 25 percent.

The data in table 7 summarize the results of objective two.

Table 7

(table continues)

Comparison of Timed Reading Tests, Forms A & B

Student	Grade (a)		Epm		Decrease	Grade (b)
	A	B	A	B		
A	2	2	2	1.5	25%	6
B	2	2	3	1.5	50%	6
C	3	3	5	5	0%	6
D	4	4	5	2.5	50%	6
E	2	2	4	4	0%	5
F	2	2	6	3	50%	4
G	2	2	2	1	50%	4
H	2	2	6	3	50%	4

Note:

Grade (a) = Grade level achieved

Epm = Errors per minute

A = Form A

B = Form B

Decrease = Decrease in errors

Grade (b) = Actual grade level

Objective three was measured by the Analytical Reading Inventory (Woods & Moe, 1977). The specific objective, "Over a period of 12 weeks, elementary school-aged students identified as having educational handicaps will improve their instructional oral reading comprehension level by

attaining a score of at least 75 percent on an informal reading inventory", was met by 6 out of the 8 students who participated in the practicum.

Only two of the students were unable to attain a score of at least 75 percent comprehension. One student, however, participated in all of the reading exercises and was enthusiastic throughout the practicum. The other student who failed to meet the 75 percent comprehension criteria ~tated in objective three was frequently absent or suspended from school.

The data in table 8 show that 6 of the 8 students read at or above the 75 percent comprehension level.

Table 8

Comparison of Timed Reading Tests: Forms A & B

	Instructional level					
Student	Grade(a)		%		Gain	Grade (b)
	A	B	A	B		
A	2	2	84	100	19%	6
B	2	2	68	84	23%	6
C	3	3	75	75	0%	6
D	4	4	75	88	17%	6
E	2	2	84	100	19%	5

(table continues)

Student	Grade		%		Gain	Grade (b)
	A	B	A	B		
F	2	2	68	84	23%	4
G	3	3	75	75	0%	4
H	2	2	68	84	23%	4

Note:

Grade (a) : Grade level achieved

A : Form A

B : Form B

% : Comprehension percentage

Gain : Gain from form A to form B

Grade (b) : Actual grade level

The fourth objective, "After the 12 week practicum period, the resource room teacher who instructs the elementary-aged students identified as having educational handicaps will implement the oral reading strategy as a supplement to the regular developmental program", was not difficult to measure. During the practicum period, the resource room teacher observed the gains being made by the students and became a more enthusiastic participant. The teacher wanted the strategy to work as much as the writer had wanted the to succeed. As a result, the teacher

welcomed the addition of the repeated readings program to his regular curriculum.

Conclusion

The first objective concerned the acquisition of reading speed. Four of the 8 students met the guidelines established in objective one, as the data in table 6 presented in the previous section. However, all eight of the students were able to increase their reading speed. Likewise, 5 of 8 students were able to meet the guideline established in objective two by decreasing their number of word errors made in one minute.

The results of the timed reading tests support the contentions of Samuels (1979). Samuels hypothesized that poor readers learn to develop reading speed and fluency with repeated practice. Since less attention is required in decoding, the students can concentrate on comprehending the story.

The students enjoyed being timed by the writer. As noted by Samuels (1979), who observed that students become excited when they read faster, the students who participated in the practicum were also excited by their reading speed improvements. Most of them wanted to compare their results with those of other students.

Samuels' ((1979) contention that comprehension increased when reading speed and fluency are improved was observed in the data which supported objective objective

three. Seven of the 8 students were able to meet the criteria established by the the objective.

In conclusion, the results of the practicum support the theory that reading comprehension does improve as students increase the number of words and decrease the number of word errors read per minute (Samuels, 1979). Although the established criteria for objectives one and two were not met by most of the students, the majority of them made significant gains in reading speed and in decreasing errors. As a result, the resource room teacher who participated in the practicum has begun to incorporate the repeated reading strategy into his regular curriculum.

Recommendations

The writer has three specific recommendations based on the results of the practicum. First, the resource room teacher should consider developing a large chart that can be used to plot each student's gains in reading speed, errors, and comprehension. Students might enjoy keeping track of their own development and the development of others. Second, the resource room teacher should develop oral reading strategies that enable him to give immediate non-threatening feedback. Third, the resource room teacher should be encouraged to keep weekly logs that can be used to evaluate the successes and failures of the repeated reading strategy.

Dissemination

The results of the practicum were shared in five ways. First, the writer shared the results of the practicum with members of the special services department. Those staff members in turn can make the results available to the teachers with whom they come in contact.

Next, the writer submitted a copy of the practicum's results to the superintendent of schools, who then made it available to his administrative staff and school board members.

Third, the writer submitted a copy of the practicum's results to the county director of child study teams, who then made it available for distribution thoughout the county.

Fourth, the writer submitted a copy of the practicum's results to the local association for the remediation of learning disabilities.

Last, the writer submitted a copy of the practicum's results with each member of his Cluster 26A, Nova University.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. (1981). The missing ingredient: Fluent oral reading. Elementary School Journal, 81, (3), 173-177.

Clymer, T., Indisano, R., Johnson, D., Pearson, P., & Venezky, R. (1987). Ginn Reading Series (1st ed.). Lexington, Silver, Burdett & Ginn Inc.

Falzetta, J. (1987). Comparative evaluation of two sites for a new elementary school. Report for Board of education.

Gates, A., & McKillop, A. (1962). Reading Diagnostic Tests (1st ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gilbert, C., & Dardig, J. (1976). Cut-up stories to read aloud. Teacher, 93, (7), 86-87.

Heinrich, J. (1976). Elementary oral reading: Methods and materials. The Reading Teacher, 27, (3), 10-15.

Henderson, A., & Shores, R. (1982). How learning disabled student's failure to attend to suffixes affects their oral reading performance. Journal of Learning Disasbilities, 15, (3), 178-182.

Hoffman, J. (1987). Rethinking the role of oral reading in basal instruction. The Elementary School Journal, 87, (3), 367-373.

Hoffman, J. (1982). Is there a legitimate place for oral reading instruction in a developmental reading program? The Elementary School Journal, 81, (4), 305-310.

Hoffman, J., & Baker, C. (1981). Characterizing teacher feedback to student miscues during oral reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, 34, (8), 907-911.

Hoffman, J., & Clements, R. (1984). Reading miscues and teacher verbal feedback. The Elementary School Journal, 84, (4), 423-436.

Hoskisson, K., Sherman, T., & Smith, L. (1974). Assisted reading and parent involvement. The Reading Teacher, 27, (7), 710-714.

Hu-Pei Au, K. (1977). Analyzing oral reading errors to improve instruction. The Reading Teacher, 31, (1), 46-49.

Hutson, B., & Niles, J. (1981). How similar are patterns of miscues in oral reading and cloze tasks? Reading Improvement, 18, (2), 144-149.

Karwoski, A. (1983). Practicing oral reading skills. The Reading Teacher, 36, (2), 144-149.

King, R. (1977). How to help the "silent sounder". Teacher, 95, (3), 387-389).

Lovitt, T., & Hansen, C. (1976a). Round one- placing child in the right reader. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 9, (6), 18-24.

Lovitt, T., & Hansen, C. (1976b). The use of contingent skipping to improve oral reading and comprehension. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 9, (8), 20-26.

O'Conner, P., Stuck, G., & Wyne, M. (1979). Effects of a short-term intervention resource-room program on task

orientation and achievement. The Journal of Special Education, 13, (4), 375-384.

Office of the Superintendent. (1986). Special education enrollment. Board of Education.

Office of the Superintendent. (1986). Breakdown of pupil enrollment according to ethnic groups. Board of Education.

Office of the Superintendent. Breakdown of staff according to thnic groups. Board of Education.

Office of the Superintendent. (1987). Public school enrollments-by schools. Board of Education.

Office of the Superintendent. (1987). Public school enrollments-by grade level. Board of Education.

Office of the Superintendent. (1987). Report of food service department. Board of Education.

Office of the Superintendent. (1983). Governance Manual. Board of Education.

Rose, T. (1984). The effects of two prepractice procedures on oral reading. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27, (9), 544-555.

Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. The Reading Teacher, 6, (4), 403-408.

State Department of Education. (1984). Administrative Code, Title 6, Education (Chapter 28, Special Education).

Whisler, N. (1976). Pupil partners. Language Arts , 53, (4), 387-289.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING ORAL READING INSTRUCTION

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions.
Be a precise as possible. Thank you.

1. Is oral reading an important skill to be taught to my students?

2. Do you have a specific curriculum for teaching oral reading to your students? Please explain.

APPENDIX B

SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL HANDICAPS OF STUDENTS

HANDICAPS OF STUDENTS

Student	Classification
A	Perceptually impaired
B	Perceptually impaired
C	Socially maladjusted
D	Socially maladjusted
E	Perceptually impaired
F	Socially maladjusted
G	Perceptually impaired
H	Perceptually impaired

Note:

Perceptually impaired:

A specific learning disability that interferes with the student's ability to think, speak, read, spell, listen and/or compute.

Socially maladjusted:

Student who is unable to conform to the rules established by the school. The severely disruptive behavior interferes with the education of the student and other students (Administrative Code, Title 6, 1984).

APPENDIX C

BI-MONTHLY RECORDING SHEET

BI-MONTHLY RECORDING SHEET

STUDENT_____ DATE_____

1. Number of words read per minute_____

2. Number of errors read per minute_____

3. Percentage of correct answers_____

APPENDIX D

MECHANISM FOR RECORDING UNEXPECTED EVENTS

MECHANISM FOR RECORDING UNEXPECTED EVENTS

CLASS PERIOD _____ DAY _____ WEEK _____

SUCCESSES

FAILURES

STUDENT CONCERNS

TEACHER, WRITER CONCERNS

APPENDIX E

COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS FOR PLACEMENT PROCEDURE

PLACEMENT PROCEDURE

Each of the following questions follows this pattern:

1. Recall
2. Sequence
3. Interpretation
4. Vocabulary

Level 3 (Part 1)

1. What was Grandma doing in the story?
2. When Grandma said that her cut-out was a van, what happened next?
3. How was Ken like Grandma?
4. Define the word "work" as it was used in the story?

Level 3 (Part 2)

1. What did Grandma tell the children to do with the mix they were making?
2. Tell how many tasks the children were given?
3. Can you tell what you think is similar to making cake mix?
4. What was meant by, "a good mix"?

Level 4 (Part 1)

1. Who were the children going to see?
2. Who did the children meet last?
3. How is a fireman like a policeman?
4. What is a firehouse?

Level 4 (Part 2)

1. Tell three things that dogs can do.

2. What was the last thing said to the children?

3. Why did the child think the dog was playing (while performing a trick) when the adult said the dog was working?

4. What is a trick?

Level 5 (Part 1)

1. Who were Mom and her daughter going to see?

2. Looking out the window, what was the second thing the girl saw?

3. Compare how riding on a train might be the same or different from riding in a car.

4. What was meant by the word, "yesterday"?

Level 5 (Part 2)

1. What did Grandpa make?

2. When does the train sound its bell?

3. How are bread dough and clay the same?

4. Define "Grandpa".

Level 6 (Part 1)

1. Where did the hen say she needed help?

2. How many animals did the cat ask for help?

3. How were the dog, cat, and frog alike?

4. Define "beautiful".

Level 6 (Part 2)

1. Why didn't the duck help?

2. Who was the last animal asked by the hen?

3. If the animals continued to treat the hen this way, what was likely to happen?

4. What are ducklings?

Level 7 (Part 1)

1. What event led Andrew to become alarmed?

2. Who did Andrew tell first?

3. How are all of the people (not including Andrew) most alike?

4. What meaning did you understand for, "Nobody listens to me"?

Level 7 (Part 2)

1. Why did Andrew finally shout that there was abear in his bed?

2. How many places did Mr. Pond call to tell about the bear?

3. Why would the police, firemen, and zoo be helpful?

4. What is meant by, "zoom"?

Level 8 (Part 1)

1. What did mother tell Elizabeth Ann to do with her loose tooth?

2. How many ways did Elizabeth Ann try to remove her tooth?

3. Can you compare loosing a tooth with a tree that looses its leaves?

4. Define, "wobbly".

Level 8 (Part 2)

1. What game were the children going to play?

2. After she decided to forget about her tooth, what did Elizabeth Ann do next?

3. Why couldn't Elizabeth Ann forget about her loose tooth?

4. What is meant by, "the crack of the bat on the ball"?

Level 9 (Part 1)

1. What did Dan like to collect?

2. Which happened first, Dan thinking about his vacation, or Dan spreading his shells on his bed?

3. How are a wave and a sand dune alike?

4. What do you think are mesquite and sea oats?

Level 9 (Part 2)

1. How had Dan found the shell?

2. Who was the first person to whom Dan showed the shell?

3. How could a sea shell be called, "a piece of summer"?

4. What is an island?

Level 10 (Part 1)

1. What were the girls looking for?

2. What was the last thing Ella said?

3. What might have happened if Ella had not been with the girls?

4. What is a buzzer?

Level 10 (Part 2)

1. Who opened the door?

2. Who was first up the stairs?

3. Why did someone have to take Charlie's hand?

4. What is an apartment?

Level 11 (Part 1)

1. What was Tommy doing?

2. What was the first event that actually occured in the story?

3. How can an accident prove to be a lucky one?

4. What is a channel?

Level 11 (Part 2)

1. What did Quig's mother say about his plan to fish at night?

2. What event led to Quig's decision to fish at night?

3. Why do you think it is better to catch frogs at night?

4. What did, " bluff", mean in the story?

Level 12 (Part 1)

1. What were Chester and Walter going to swap?

2. What was the last thing that Walter said?

3. What justification do you think Chester had for wanting to make a swap?

4. What does the author mean when he says that," Chester made the yo-yo snap back into his hand smartly"?

Level 12 (Part 2)

1. Where had Chester gotten the yo-yo?

2. What two things did Chester say that convinced Walter to swap?

3. How does Walter resemble a salesman?

4. What is meant by, "fanning the cards"?

Level 13 (Part 1)

1. Where was the wagon train at the story's beginning?

2. When did Emma discover where they were going?

3. What would happen if they arrived at the river and the bridge was blocked?

4. What and where is Missouri?

Level 13 (Part 2)

1. How did Emma's words affect her brother?

2. When did they find out the truth about the ticks?

3. What justification do the Texas cowboys have for refusing to allow the cattle to enter Texas?

Level 14 (Part 1)

1. Where was Anna?

2. Name four things Anna heard.

3. Compare the behavior of Rudi with a caged animal.

4. What does the author mean when he says that Anne, "was far too tied up in knots..."?

Level 14 (Part 2)

1. What was Anne going to turn on?

2. What events led to Anne turning on the reading machine?

3. If the record continued to play, what was likely to happen?

4. What is meant by, "startling"?

APPENDIX F

MECHANISM FOR RECORDING READING SPEED, ERRORS, AND COMPREHENSION

STUDENT_____ DATE_____

1. Number of words read per minute_____

2. Number of errors read per minute_____

3. Perentage of correct answers_____

APPENDIX G

MECHANISM FOR RECORDING READING SPEED AND WORD RECOGNITION ERRORS

RECORDING MECHANISM

Student_____ Date_____

Reading speed ____

Word Errors ____

APPENDIX H

RATIONALE FOR TIMED READING

RATIONALE FOR TIMED READING

The writer chose to include timed testing as part of his practicum after carefully reviewing Samuels' (1979) rationale for using timed reading in a developmental reading program. Samuels emphasized that the student's development of reading speed is more important than the development of his or her accuracy. Samuels observed that if word recognition accuracy is overemphasized, the student becomes anxious at the thought of making a mistake. Further, the student's ability to develop fluency is impeded. Conversely, Samuels believed that with the improvement of reading speed, the student is actually motivated by the gains he or she makes in reading speed, fluency, and comprehension.

APPENDIX I

TEACHER VERIFICATION OF PRACTICUM

ATLANTIC CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW JERSEY AVENUE SCHOOL
35 North New Jersey Avenue
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401

Mr. Richard Knupp
Learning Disabilities Consultant
Richmond Avenue School
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401

February 29, 1988

Dear Mr. Knupp,

I want to send you a personal note of appreciation for allowing me to assist you in the implementation of the repeated reading method. My students showed an improvement in their reading speed and comprehension skills in the time from November 5, 1987, to February 5, 1988. They read with more confidence and made fewer word errors. I intend to include the repeated reading method with my regular curriculum.

Sincerely,
Mr Charles Frech
Resource room teacher

MAR 2